



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

considerably, and the estimated output for 1922, if fully achieved, would make available more fuel than is needed for transport and manufactures at their present level. An ample fuel supply will react in turn upon the state of transport, which now hampers industry very considerably. It will, however, be impossible for Russia, if not helped by credits from abroad, to do more than widen, very slowly, the vicious circle of worn-out transport and starved factories that are unable, because of the difficulty of carrying to them sufficient fuel, raw material, and food for the workers, to do much to help in building up the railways again. If this vicious circle is broken in 1922 by outside help, the Russian budget for 1923 will be an even more hopeful sign of the possibility of restoring Europe than the budget for the present year.

PEACE WORKERS IN WAR TIMES

Some Self-Explanatory Correspondence

In a magazine called *Unity*, under date of January 19, 1922, the Rev. Charles Francis Dole took occasion to pay his respects to the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE* and to the American Peace Society as follows:

PEACE SOCIETIES AND WAR

The December issue of the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE* tells its readers in one of its editorial articles that the American Peace Society "has stood by the United States Government in all its wars of over a century!" Is not this an extraordinary record for the oldest peace society in the land? Do they really mean *all* the wars? The infamous Mexican War? The wars with our Indian tribes? The little wars, as with Mexico and in the West Indies, that President Wilson had engaged us in, while he was supposed to be "keeping us out of War"? Did the American Peace Society really stand by our government in the prosecution of the Spanish War, and afterwards in conquering the Philippine Islands? What is the use of such a peace society as that! Let us in charity give the editor the chance to make, if he truthfully can, at least some modification of this scandalous history of supporting the government through all wars, "thick and thin," good and bad.

Has any great cause of humanity ever been served as feebly as the cause for which peace societies exist? When no war is going on, the friends of peace have nothing special to do, except genially to hope that there will never be another war to disturb them. Of course, other people can see no reason to attend peace meetings when the friends of peace show no concern in the subject. But when the challenge of war comes, and there might be something to do, at least in opposing a "wicked" war, that modern Temple of Janus, the peace society, is closed, and nothing is doing till the dull time of peace returns and there is nothing to do! Did the anti-slavery movement proceed by such indifferent conduct as this? No! It began with John Woolman, traveling down into the slaving-holding colonies and having heart-to-heart talks with the slave-owners. And it went on till hundreds of thousands of people were proclaiming slavery as an intolerable sin. So with the movement against the alcoholic drinks. Millions of men were converted to swear the oath, "*Carthago delenda est*," against these drinks.

The *ADVOCATE OF PEACE* goes on to indulge in prophecy. It says: "Should a situation like unto that of 1917 once more arise, this society would undoubtedly stand by its government again." We call this melancholy. Have these friends of peace learned nothing out of the horrible seven years just passed? Has no ray of light penetrated their minds that the churches and colleges and peace societies of America may have made a colossal mistake in supporting the war! Can they not see that wars go on, following one another, because the governmental and military group reckon on ex-

actly this state of mind among church leaders and "friends of peace," which this pathetic paragraph voices, presuming that the good people will always help win the war? Suppose the time when the government becomes aware that the churches, or one-tenth part of them, would stick to their job of proclaiming the brotherhood of mankind, and would die, as soldiers die, rather than forsake their faith and kill their brothers, what government on earth would dare to begin a war in the face of such opposition? What is the use of a peace society, after such a war as we have seen, that goes out of its way to promise the government that it may *always* rely upon its support in carrying on war?

CHARLES F. DOLE.

Our attention was first called to Dr. Dole's article by a letter, under date of January 30, from Mrs. Lucia Ames Mead, of Boston, who wrote:

To the Editor of the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE*.

DEAR SIR: I was amazed to see your editorial statement that the American Peace Society has stood by the United States Government in all its wars for over a century.

I was a director of the American Peace Society for twelve years, including the period of the Spanish War and the Philippine aftermath. This was not true as regards that war, as you will see by consulting back numbers of the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE*.

As to the Mexican War, the President of the Society, Wm. Jay, was opposed to it, and I think you will find that the back numbers testify to that very forcibly.

I have just read the enclosed clipping from *Unity*, by Rev. Chas. F. Dole, which I beg that you will publish, together with my own communication.

Yours sincerely,

LUCIA AMES MEAD.

Under date of February 1, we wrote to Mrs. Mead the following letter, a copy of which was sent to Dr. Dole:

MRS. LUCIA AMES MEAD,

19 Euston Street, Brookline, Mass.

MY DEAR MRS. MEAD:

You and Mr. C. F. Dole seem to enjoy criticizing the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE* more, we fear, than the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE* is able to profit by the criticism. The *ADVOCATE OF PEACE* says many things during the year, but it receives no word of commendation from either of you. It appears that you are concerned primarily, for some reason, to hunt out those things which you can speak of unfavorably. If only you could see your way clear to take, rather, the concrete and important things for which we have definitely and openly stood through a century, criticize them, and show wherein they are wrong or how they could be improved, you would render a more promising service to the thing which you and the rest of us are trying as best we can to promote.

The fact is that the American Peace Society exists for the purpose of ending war as a means of settling international disputes. That has been its aim from the outset. It is its aim now. When that aim ceases the American Peace Society will cease. The American Peace Society, faced with an America threatened by the onrush of a European war power in 1917, took the position that the clarion, unmistakable call to every one of us in America was to end the war by winning it. That was, we believe, the position of sanity then. Granted the same conditions again, the American Peace Society would, we hope, take the same ground. The American Peace Society never has been a non-resistant society. Non-resistant officials have been connected with its work, but they have never tried to make the Society non-resistant. During the Civil War the American Peace Society stood by the central government. It was opposed to the Mexican War; it was opposed to the Civil War; it was opposed to the Spanish War; it was opposed to the last war; it is and always has been opposed to all war. It sprang from the opposition to war. But if in our ungoverned world American institutions, the life of America, be threatened by some nation or group of nations faring forth to war, the American Peace Society should be no traitor to the glory

that is the United States. In its opposition to the Mexican War the American Peace Society opposed *war* and not the nation that has always made the work of this Society possible. The same thing is true of the Spanish War. There comes a time when war, beating at the doors of a nation, can be overcome in but one of two ways—by succumbing to the enemy or by defeating the enemy. These are the stern facts in a practical world. The greatest injury to the movement in behalf of any attainable or desirable international peace has been done not by the so-called "militarists," but by those who, in the name of "pacifism," have refused to recognize these facts.

You, Mr. Dole, and others interested to discover those things with which you can disagree are undoubtedly rendering a service. May your criticisms continue. We are inclined to agree with Mr. Dole, that no great cause of humanity has ever been served as feebly as the cause for which peace societies exist, unless perhaps it be the cause for which Christianity exists. But we would remind both you and Mr. Dole that "that modern Temple of Janus, the Peace Society," is never "closed." Our efforts here are not confined to sporadic criticisms of those who do not agree with us. They are continuous. Mr. Dole complains that the "friends of peace learned nothing out of the horrible seven years just passed." Our own feeling is that the trouble with the organized peace movement just now is that men like Mr. Dole seem to have "learned nothing out of the horrible seven years just passed." He seems to content himself with the same metaphysical joy-rides that appealed to him in the days prior to 1914. But both you and he will go on finding space in *Unity*, proclaiming your peculiar philosophy of "brotherhood" in terms of captious, unwarranted, and amazing criticism of some little statement here or there with which, alas, you do not agree. Keep at it, dear friends. You are really accomplishing more good than they who prefer to praise. True, Swinburne once remarked: "I have never been able to see what should attract men to the profession of criticism but the noble pleasure of praising." But Swinburne was only a poet.

Always fraternally yours,

ARTHUR D. CALL.

Under date of February 13, Dr. Dole wrote:

DEAR MR. CALL:

I don't know, of course, what Mrs. Mead wrote you, but I am sorry that you should think, in the case of either of us, that we just live to tease and criticize the work of another fellow-mortal. If this is all it comes to, I shouldn't have the right to impose now upon your time and patience. In fact, it always seems to me that the main question about criticism is whether it is true. A man would go to some trouble, I should suppose, to hear criticism that might better his work. I think the severe judgment hardly ever does us any harm, whereas it is the easy stuff that may hurt us.

Now, I should surely have liked it in you if you could have imagined that, whatever we said, it might have reason in it! Did it not? Was not your expression in the paragraphs commented upon at least unfortunate? I do believe that you could have well afforded to set that matter right.

You official people are always in danger of forgetting that a society like the American Peace Society *does not do well* if it is only saying the same things that its founders said! And perhaps all of you who have lived in Washington in war time might do a good thing for the spiritual health to raise the query in "psycho-analysis," whether the net effect of the war on all of us, but specially on you who have to accept a very artificial atmosphere, is not disturbing both to good thinking and to a truly magnanimous poise.

Now, you may say this is "saucy." But if it is saucy, it is I upon whom the blow falls, and if nothing of truth is in it, you are clear beyond hurt, and if (why not if?) there is matter in it, why shouldn't you be glad to have an old fellow say so in friendly wise, such truth being very important? Why should I care for anything more than that you should do a great piece of work in effective manner!

Yours sincerely,

C. F. DOLE.

P. S.—I have tried faithfully in the last eight years to

know all the truth or facts that I could reach. It would be very interesting to me, using the honest "Socratic" method all around, to learn how you can arrive at some of the sentences in your letter to Mrs. Mead. It is as if you still held the old war-time notion that *one* nation was guilty of attacking civilization! But life is not long enough to carry on an inquiry of this kind by correspondence, if either one had any right to urge it. But I do wonder if you have been too busy to work out the main lines in which a peace society secretary ought to be fortified?

Under date of February 20, Mrs. Mead wrote:

MY DEAR MR. CALL:

I have not had time before this to reply to your letter, which very much surprised me by your generalities and assumptions. You assume that I am a non-resister. I never have been one. That I take Mr. Dole's point of view. I do not, though I reverence him and do not call his interpretation of God's will "psychological joy-rides." You assume that I am "primarily concerned to hunt out those things which" I "can speak of unfavorably." I do not know that I ever sent a criticism before to the *ADVOCATE*. Can you recall an instance?

You say, "In its opposition to the Mexican War, the American Peace Society opposed *war* and not the nation that has always made the work of this Society possible. The same thing is true of the Spanish War." I appeal to the record. This statement is not correct. I have never criticized the *ADVOCATE* for its stand as to the World War. I spoke simply and solely of the Mexican and Spanish wars, and I am sure I am right that the American Peace Society opposed the government in both those wars and was not merely condemning war in general.

Of course, I find much in the *ADVOCATE* that I am ready to praise. Omitting praise hurts only you and not the readers, but failing to respectfully call attention to a serious historical error leaves readers to accept it as truth. I am sure you will not feel so sensitive about this when you think it over.

Yours very sincerely,

LUCIA AMES MEAD.

REPLY

Out of respect to the record the following facts are pertinent:

(1) *With reference to the Mexican War:* Under date of May 24, 1847, the minutes show that Mr. Beckwith, then Secretary of the American Peace Society, submitted thirteen resolutions, some of which condemned the Mexican War. None of these resolutions, however, were adopted. At the meeting of the Society in October, 1847, "The following resolve was passed: *Resolved*, That we think it expedient for the Society to petition the Congress at their approaching session against the further continuance of the war with Mexico and to solicit similar petitions from the friends of peace throughout the country." Under date of January 4, 1848, it is recorded "that petitions had been forwarded on behalf of the Society to both houses of Congress, in accordance with the vote of the committee." So much for the official record concerning the American Peace Society's opposition to the government during the Mexican War.

(2) *With reference to the Spanish War:* From the minutes of the meeting of May 23, 1898, it appears that "a letter was read from Mrs. Louisa J. Bruen (daughter of William Jay) urging strongly the holding of public meetings, with the object of preventing the threatened continuance of the war with Spain, offering a liberal contribution if such meetings should be held in New York City. Informal discussion followed and it was decided not to be best for this Society to move in the matter at present." From the minutes of May 9, 1898, it appears that "President Paine summed up the work of the Society as not so much consisting in efforts, by petition and otherwise, to prevent war in times of great excitement and passion as in the constant education of the public sentiment and conscience of the nation. 'Only along this line,' he said, 'is there hope of success.'" Thus reads the record of that period.

We agree with Dr. Dole "that the main question about criticism is, whether it is true." We hope that Dr. Dole and Mrs. Mead will continue their search for any "serious historical error" which they may, perchance, discover in the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE*. *Veritas simplex oratio est*, or ought to be. For the present we are forced to stand by our editorial of December and by our letter of February 1.

ARTHUR DEERIN CALL.

INTERNATIONAL NOTES

THE NORTHERN PEACE UNION, composed of peace societies in Sweden, Norway, and Denmark, is pressing the movement it inaugurated at its congress in Copenhagen, July 1 and 2, 1921, to have English made the language of diplomatic intercourse. It has asked the governments in Europe and Asia to investigate opinion in their countries as to accepting English as the universal language; and if not that language, then some other, living or artificial. When reports have been completed, the Northern Peace Union announces, it purposes to convene an international congress to give further consideration to the project.

Copies of the resolution adopted at the Union's congress last July are being sent out from Stockholm by Knut Sandstedt, secretary general, under date of January 15, 1922. The resolution follows:

The congress expresses as its opinion that the English language should be adopted as the international language of the world, collaterally with the language of each nation, and urges the executive committee of the Northern Peace Union to work for the realization of this idea, especially among the small nations.

The congress begs, moreover, to submit to the governments of the different States and to the League of Nations the question of instituting an inquiry as to a common international language, and on the basis of this investigation recommend the introduction of the language found to be most practical as a subject of study in the schools and colleges of the world.

EVIDENTLY SOME OF THE EDITORS on the other side of the water are as greatly exercised over the bonus proposals as are many of those at home. From the *London Outlook*, it is learned that "the rest of the world will gape with astonishment" at what are described as the amazing proposals now before Congress. The editor of the *Outlook* seems so seriously concerned over the post-war attitude in this country toward the soldiers that he brings to mind the fears of many of the British and French during the war, arising from what they regarded as the excessively liberal payment and treatment of the men on the firing line; for he continues, not entirely accurately:

Impelled by the powerful propaganda of the American Legion, comprising most American ex-service men, Congress appears inclined to vote the country's late warriors £200,000,000 at once, under a law which will call ultimately for the expenditure of between 15 and 20 milliards. Inflation and other financial evils are feared if the 4,000,000 men who were in the army, four-fifths or five-sixths of whom never reached the firing line, become, with their wives and children, dependents upon the State. This is what happened after the American Civil War; the pension lists were swollen

to magnificent proportions by the political wire-pulling of the veterans, banded together for concerted action under the name of the Grand Army of the Republic, like the American Legion of today. Business and financial interests, of course, oppose saddling the country with such a mill-stone, but Mr. Harding, who once definitely came out as opposed to the colossal "bonus," now appears to be wavering.

IT IS NOT TO BE WONDERED that Arthur J. Balfour has been chary, throughout the years of his distinguished service to the British Empire, of decorations at the hands of his sovereign. Upon his return to England, after serving notably at the Washington Conference, and probably reaching there the high-water mark of his statesmanship, Mr. Balfour was made a Knight of the Garter. Immediately newspaper artists all over the world began drawing pictures of Mr. Balfour in the uniform or regalia or whatever it is that a Knight of the Bath is supposed to wear, and their productions were fearful and wonderful.

One that passed before many eyes was the work of an artist who had neither seen nor heard of Mr. Balfour's abnormally long figure, with its strange, appealing grace—a curiously awkward grace, if that contradictory expression may be used—for he pictured the calm, handsome, philosophic Balfour head upon the body of a professional base-ball player. In place of the slender, gently swaying lines that would be Mr. Balfour's legs in any faithful picture, he showed a pair of stocky, muscular underpinnings, set out in knickerbockers, and planted far apart on the earth, as though to catch a line drive to center field.

IT IS, PERHAPS, SIGNIFICANT of the new era into which Ireland seems to be entering, despite the bitter animosities prevailing among her leaders, that the world is not only giving attention to Irish politics, but to Irish culture. Lately there came from Paris to American newspapers an item telling of the first exhibition of Irish art ever given in Paris. The exhibition includes painting, a little sculpture, some black-and-white work, bookbinding, needlework, and leather. It was stated that Sir John Lavery has been accorded the honors of the exhibition. His work speaks of Ireland's travail, being devoted largely to paintings of political leaders. Among the younger Irish artists, it also is stated, the influence of French art is apparent.

HERE IS A STORY that may mean much to the world. It suggests that the Krupps, for so many years an important section of the German military machine, are turning their energies into the ways of peace. *The Long Morning Telegraph* says:

To give a list of the present peace output of Krupps would be to enumerate practically every article into the manufacture of which iron or steel in all their varieties enter, from a steamer's crank-shaft to a pen nib. High-speed machine tools are an important item of manufacture; so are dynamos and electrical appliances, steam-engines and boilers, motor engines, construction steel (buildings), screw propellers, and bosses, motors, turbines, hydraulic presses, steam hammers, tubes, retorts, rails, paper-making machinery, textile machinery, agricultural machinery, cutlery and